

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: LIVERPOOL RANGE QUARRY (SSD-68063715)

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY MEETING

PANEL: TERRY BAILEY (CHAIR)

SARAH DINNING (PANEL MEMBER)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE

STUART MORGAN

COMMUNITY

REPRESENTATIVE:

ANNETTE PIPER

LOCATION: CASSILIS COMMUNITY CENTRE

BUCCLEUGH STREET, CASSILIS

DATE: 11:15AM – 11:25AM

WEDNESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR TERRY BAILEY: Good morning.

5 **MS ANNETTE PIPER**: Good morning.

MR BAILEY: And we're meeting today to discuss the state significant development application for the Liverpool Range Quarry –

10 **MS PIPER**: Yes.

MR BAILEY: - which is SSD-68063715.

MS PIPER: Yes.

MR BAILEY: And we're speaking today from Wiradjuri land and I acknowledge the traditional owners as the custodians of the country on which we're meeting today.

MS PIPER: Yes.

MR BAILEY: My name is Terry Bailey and I'm the Chair of the Panel, and joining me is my fellow commissioner, Sarah Dinning, and we're supported by staff members from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission with Stuart and Kendall

- And in the interests of openness and transparency, the meeting will be recorded, and the full transcript will be made available on the Commission's website in the coming few days.
- And it is just a reminder that we are discussing today the Liverpool Range Quarry, not the wind farm which was approved back in 2018. And just before we do begin, before you do start the presentation, if you could just introduce yourself so that we've got it on tape.

MS PIPER: Annette Piper.

MR BAILEY: Thank you. And we'll hand across.

MS PIPER: Pardon?

35

45

40 **MR BAILEY**: We'll hand across to you.

MS PIPER: Oh, okay. All right. So, I'm just going to talk on a couple of points. But one of the major ones which I find very concerning is that the Environmental Impact Statement for this project attracted 4 supporting submissions and 80 objecting submissions. Looking at those supporting submissions, it appears that two of the supporters of the project are namely Precision Drill and Blast Pty Ltd and Paul Ashley are contractors for ADRG, who will benefit financially from the project.

One supporter appears to come from their own office at Belmont, listed as a name withheld. And the other person is Matthew Welsey who is a signed up Tilt host and he has his usual single sentence of support.

It's noted that the Applicant has listed all of these in their Response to Submissions Report, however, they have omitted to declare these apparent conflicts of interest. To me, this reeks of claiming benefits for the project through social licence via the supporting submissions, when effectively this is dishonest. And this is the Proponent that you are asked to approved their project for.

Now, I have some data with some pages which I'm happy to leave with you, which are some screenshots which show the links. And so, the name withheld from Belmont, and ADRG is registered at Belmont. It seems unlikely for somebody else from Belmont to actually participate in the submission process.

Paul Ashley from Armidale is listed on a previous project of ADRG with his name and his business listed. The Precision Drill and Blast are also listed on the ADRG website, and they do state in theirs that it they will benefit in their submission, however, that is not referred to, it's just the benefits are referred to in the submission. So, I'm happy to leave that with you.

The other thing I am concerned about is the way that they downplay the distance of neighbours. Now – sorry, okay, we're not in a metropolitan area, as you can tell quite clearly, and for example, my home is 5 kilometres from my back boundary. And yet they're downplaying anybody who is further than 5 kilometres, and I think that's unfair in a rural situation. And so, people, you know, they've kind of got, roughly they've got on this map, they've got three from the local area.

Now, if you look at that particular property, there is only one neighbour that's not an associated neighbour within that 5 kilometres, but anybody who is further away, which is the 37, you know, a good proportion of those are actually neighbours. So, we'd like you to take that into account when you're considering that.

And yes, we've kind of talked about the distance and there are quite a lot of homes that are within actually quite close distances of the boundary but not particularly of that potentially the actual site. And so, like, you've got 3.78 kilometres from the old Turee homes, 3.65 kilometres to Quindalup, 2.12 to Corinda, 4.8 to Bedalla and 4.86 to Rangeview. And it is 9 kilometres for the owner to land to get to his own bull selling complex. So, the 5 kilometres is and needs to go.

And probably the last thing is cumulative impact. It's repeatedly waved away and said, "Oh, well, the NSW State Government is doing something, but they haven't finished it yet." But from a personal perspective, my home is 3 kilometres from the Valley of the Winds Project. I'm 8 kilometres from the Liverpool Range Wind Project. I'm 12 kilometres from this quarry, and I'm 15 kilometres from Birrawa Solar. So, how much is enough cumulative impact?

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

You know, I don't think it's – you're discounting, you look at it one project at a time, but it's not just me, it's my neighbours as well, and we're all facing multiple projects and the impacts of those projects. Basically, enough is enough.

5 That's it. I kept it to, like, 5 minutes, sorry.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Annette, and we deeply appreciate, and it's really concise and very to the point.

10 **MS PIPER**: Okay.

MR BAILEY: And for your awareness, many of the things that you've raised there are considerations that Sarah and I have been talking about.

MR BAILEY: It'll be on the tape, but please don't read too much into that 5 kilometre line because as a rural living person, it doesn't make a lot of sense.

MS PIPER: Yes, no, no.

20 **MR BAILEY**: And it is part of our conversation around ...

MS PIPER: Yes, cool. Okay. Yes.

MR BAILEY: So, just to be aware – I think the things that you've raised are areas that we're discussing and thinking about ...

MS PIPER: Okay.

30

35

MR BAILEY: ... when we're looking at this.

MS PIPER: Yes, yes, and also, you know, the way that the Proponent goes, "Oh, and it's so wonderful and all of these people have commenced – or these four people – have commented how wonderful the benefits are." But when you've got vested interests and that's not declared ...

MR BAILEY: We understand your concern there, we do.

MS PIPER: So, that also bends that whole reporting. Yes.

40 **MR BAILEY**: It's all so clear.

MS PIPER: It's all self-explanatory. Would you like those?

MR BAILEY: Yes, that'll be great. That will be published, so just – yes, so I just wanted to check –

MS PIPER: No, it's all right.

MR BAILEY: - whether you want to hold it ...

MS PIPER: No, no, no, it's all right, we just, you know, it's got my handwriting on it and whatever, so just do what you'd like, but yes.

MR BAILEY: So, it was just to make sure, that's all, just on the reaction.

MS PIPER: Yes.

5

30

MR BAILEY: And just as you'd know, thank you, and there is a submission period that's still open for the Independent Planning Commission until Wednesday next week.

MS PIPER: I don't need to do it on top of that, that's okay.

MR BAILEY: No, you've got that, and what you've given us today in the transcript will appear as well. There might be one word that gets a little blocking out, we'll check that on the transcript.

MS PIPER: That's all right, you can make it – it can be close enough. You'll get the gist.

MR BAILEY: Everyone will get the gist, there'll be no ... But thank you for your time.

25 **MS PIPER**: Okay.

MR BAILEY: And thank you for the submission.

MS PIPER: Yes, yes, okay, all right. Well, good luck with the rest of the day.

MR BAILEY: Thank you.

MS PIPER: You've got it in the air conditioning, at least that's good.

35 **MR BAILEY**: Yes.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED